

ORIGINAL
FILE

RECEIVED

JUN 16 1992

INVENTURES, INC.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Design & Development: 14 Norton Road, Monmouth Junction, NJ 08852
Business Office: 1480 Route 46, #211B, Parsippany, NJ 07054

(908)329-3537
(201)316-0647

June 9, 1992

Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED
JUN 15 1992
MAIL BRANCH

92-901

RE: PROPOSALS PUT FORTH TO IMPLEMENT THE TELEPHONE
CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1991 (CC DOCKET NO. ~~92-20~~)

Dear Madam or Sir:

In accordance with the requests of the Commission for comments and proposals on methods for the implementation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 (TCPA), I am hereby enclosing a description of a method, by way of a new technology, which addresses the issues raised by the Commission.

Method:

The proposed method, developed by INVENTURES, Inc., of Parsippany, NJ, is called the "NO"-TONE™ system, and is the equivalent of placing an electronic "No Soliciting" sign on a telephone.

Method of operation:

The "NO"-TONE™ system intercepts a call directed at a subscriber's phone *before* a ring is generated. It produces a combination of messages recognized by both live operators and autodialers, requesting the termination of a soliciting call. Live operator solicitors would hear the message and terminate the call, and autodialers, with the use of currently available technology, will detect the message and terminate the call. If a call is not terminated, the "NO"-TONE™ system generates a ring on the subscriber's phone and puts the call through.

Method of implementation:

1. The "NO"-TONE™ system can take the form of a very low cost device used by the telephone subscriber in conjunction with a telephone, or
2. The system may take the form of a value-added service offered by individual telephone companies.

No. of Copies rec'd 0+5
List A B C D E

Cost:

The cost of the system is estimated at \$10., when sold as an accompanying device to a telephone, or at \$1 - \$3 a month, when offered as a value-added service by the telephone company.

Governing body of law:

The live operator solicitor, as well as the operator of an autodialer, would be governed by a body of law which has long been in place for solicitors knocking on their prospective client's doors. This law already requires that a solicitor refrain from soliciting in a place where a sign clearly states "No Soliciting".

Advantages for the telephone subscriber:

1. The subscriber is not interrupted by unwanted calls.
2. The subscriber's phone/line is clearly and easily marked as not wanting to receive soliciting calls.
2. The subscriber incurs only a minimal investment for the device or telephone service.
3. The subscriber is not aware of calls terminated before a ring is generated on his/her phone - the system, while operating, is transparent to the subscriber.
4. The subscriber does not have to register himself/herself on every "do-not-call" list or other national or regional database.

Advantages for live operators:

1. Operators can easily identify a subscriber who does not wish to be interrupted with a soliciting call, and terminate the call before the subscriber is aware of it.
2. Operators save a considerable amount of money and time by not having to check each called name against a "do-not-call" list or other regional or national databases.
3. The clear identification by the "NO"-TONE™ system would prevent an operator from mistakenly making a call on a subscriber, who's name may appear in any one of several "do-not-call" lists and databases.
4. Operators no longer have to suffer the brunt of an angry subscriber's frustration.
5. Operators know that those whom they call on, and do not have a "NO"-TONE™ system, indeed are willing to accept such calls.
6. Operators who terminate calls upon hearing the "NO"-TONE™ system's message, reduce their risk of, and exposure to lawsuits considerably.

Advantages for autodialer users:

1. With the "NO"-TONE™ system in use, Autodialers no longer have to be banned, allowing them the same advantages as those seen by the live operators.
2. There would no longer be a need to devise a list of exemptions for autodialer uses - those subscribers who do not wish to receive autodialer calls, can do so quite clearly and effectively with the system.

Comments on other proposed methods:

1. National and regional "do-not-call" lists and databases are extremely expensive and difficult to administer and maintain.
2. The task of checking each subscriber's name against national and regional "do-not-call" lists and databases is extremely difficult and onerous.
3. Mistakes made by live operators, and resulting from the difficulty of checking subscriber names against national and regional "do-not-call" lists and databases, will result in added litigation and legal activities.
4. Instead of having to police the industry, this device lets each individual, company or institution, clearly state its intentions regarding soliciting calls, in a manner that is both effective, unequivocal and very inexpensive.
5. Instead of having to produce new bodies of law for each type of intrusion, found annoying by an individual or group, the individual or group could very simply, and inexpensively, change the message on their own "NO"-TONE™ system to include the type of solicitation or intrusion of which they wish to be spared.
6. This is the only method which deals fairly and effectively, as well as take into account the wishes of all parties in the dispute. Unwanted intrusions are ended, industries are not banned, and normal business activities may continue.

I hope that a review of the suggested method, as well as the comments on the other proposed methods will convince you of this method's clear advantages in being more effective, less expensive, and far less onerous to all parties involved, including the Commission.

If any additional comments or questions are required, please don't hesitate to contact me at 201-316-0647.

Very truly yours,


Yaniv Sneor
President